

Minutes
State Board of Education Study Session
Monday, March 8, 2004

The Arizona State Board of Education held a Special Study Session at the Flowing Wells District Office, 1556 West Prince, Tucson, Arizona 85705. The meeting was called to order at 10:10AM.

Members Present

Ms. Nadine Mathis-Basha, President
Dr. Matthew Diethelm, Vice President
Ms. Armida Bittner
Ms. JoAnne Hilde
Superintendent Tom Horne
Ms. Joanne Kramer
Dr. John Pedicone

Members Absent

Dr. Michael Crow
Ms. Evangelina "Conkie" Hoover

Board Business

Pledge of Allegiance, moment of silence and roll call.

1. Ms. Basha thanked Dr. Pedicone for hosting today's study session. The Board will be doing more study sessions around the state for the purpose of taking a more in-depth look at specific issues as well as being more accessible to the public who wish to participate in the process.
2. Presentation, Discussion and Opportunity for Public Input Regarding the Definition and Characteristics of a "Master Teacher."

Ms. Farley thanked participants for traveling to Tucson as the Board addresses the issue of providing structure around the Master Teacher initiative, which Governor Napolitano requested in her State of the State address. Representatives from the Governor's Office and the Arizona Department of Education staff have been invited to speak regarding the Governor's expectations and definitions used by other organizations as well as. The audience was also invited to address the Board with suggestions as the Board moves forward in providing a statewide, recommended definition to the Governor and a framework for a program of assistance to individuals that receive a Master Teacher designation or seek to obtain that designation.

Ms. Becky Hill, Education Advisor, Office of the Governor, presented the Governor's recommendations stating that enough has not been done to nurture and recognize teachers in Arizona as well as to assist in professional development. The key points of the Governor's program address the following issues:

- Other than state certification, there is no process to recognize teachers;
- Redesign endorsements, beginning with middle school;
- Master teacher principles to be considered:
 - Definition components may include:
 - Engage in substantive, on-going professional development,
 - Coursework directly related to certification and highly qualified requirements of NCLB,
 - National Board Certification,
 - Community and professional service,
 - Expertise in the field – time in the classroom, student achievement (possibly comparable standard), peer-to-peer assessments, and
 - Ability to mentor.

- Unresolved issues
 - How much weight should be given to National Board Certification,
 - How does someone get into the Master Teacher pipeline,
 - What are the on-going responsibilities of a Master Teacher, and
 - Master Teacher program may be able to fit in with performance pay.

Ms. Kathy Wiebke, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Highly Qualified Professionals, Arizona Department of Education, addressed the Board regarding the programs already in place in Arizona that can be built upon. This discussion sets a tone in Arizona that quality teaching matters.

Overviews:

- Career Ladder,
- Teacher of the Year Program,
- National Board Certification (187 now and 130 in the pipeline), and
- Rodel's Extra-Ordinary Teacher Program.

Comments on this subject were heard from the following:

Greg Miller, Challenge Charter School, suggested there should not be a single path to achieve this classification and asked the Board to look at national recognitions by organizations like the Center of Education Reform, Education Leaders Council, American Board of Certification, and others.

Dr. Donna Lewis, Associate Superintendent for Accountability, Arizona Department of Education, talked about "proving their worth" documents recently done in some districts and pointed out the need to simplify by looking for overlapping categories. Conclusions from her former district could be shared with the Board.

Dr. Pedicone stated the ultimate objective is to identify top teachers. The expectation is that every teacher moves forward professionally, but student achievement is the ultimate goal. Should this program be limited?

Cheryl Lebo, Associate Superintendent for Teacher Quality, Arizona Department of Education, stated an evaluation should be made as to how this program plays into underperforming schools, encouraging strong teachers to be in underperforming schools.

Becky Hill commented that this program will have more than one goal: to nurture and develop every teacher and to place those teachers that have mentoring abilities. There may be a couple of scopes for many goals.

Superintendent Horne pointed out that there is a process of identifying outstanding teachers that the Solutions Teams are putting together. The Teams are undergoing rigorous training and then are being certified.

Phyllis Schwartz, Associate Superintendent of School Effectiveness, Arizona Department of Education, stated that the selection of Solution Team members is a rigorous process and the criteria outlined by Ms. Hill is what they are looking for in this process regarding teachers' professional involvement and how they have served beyond the classroom.

Rick Meyers, retired from IBM and currently with Southern Arizona Leadership Council (SALC), gave an example of what IBM did to re-establish professions and create positions like "distinguished engineer" and "certified project management professionals", which set the culture for the organization and created change agents within the company. The Master Teacher program can build a sense of community among the Master Teachers and help re-invent the education system from within.

Ms. Hilde pointed out that although alternative paths are important, before they are discussed, there has to be an understanding of what the end product looks like in terms of criteria, definition of student achievement and mentoring. This program must also address accessibility for any teacher anywhere in Arizona.

Christina Lawson, Prescott College, stated that teacher preparation is a good time to establish these expectations.

Bob Hendricks, University of Arizona, pointed out that this is a marvelous concept and cautioned that this not become another bureaucratic structure nor just a simple check list. It could also easily develop into something so complicated that the purpose could be defeated. His hope is that a teacher profile could be established, aligned with the state standards and translated into language that is understood by anyone who is preparing to become a teacher.

Dr. Diethelm raised two issues:

- How to identify a Master Teacher, and
- What do we expect from Master Teachers after recognition.

Dr. Pedicone stressed the importance of recognizing those teachers who are wonderful in the classroom but would feel guilty for taking time out to coach others.

Superintendent Horne stated that at a minimum, it would be reasonable to expect that mentoring would be a requirement.

Ms. Bittner spoke about her involvement with the ADE Professional Development Program for the past three years and asked how these efforts would play into this program. These are very good training opportunities and a good resource.

Kathy Wiebke responded that the programs Ms. Bittner referred to are a combining of two units that conduct training. However, one area focuses on teacher standards and the other on student standards. Ms. Wiebke sees these two areas working together more as this program is pursued.

John Wright, Vice President, Arizona Education Association, agrees that a balance of quality teaching and leadership needs to be achieved. An adjustment for time and scheduling is required at the building level to incorporate a program like this.

Rick Meyers added that IBM, with 330,000 employees, had classifications for “senior engineers” (10,000 total) who were good at and focused on their job and “distinguished engineers” (150 total) who were allotted time to research, mentor and teach. Mr. Meyers stated it was amazing what the 150 distinguished engineers could do to bring about change in the company culture.

Christina Lawson voiced concern regarding the teacher who may not want to leave the classroom.

Dr. Pedicone stated that this is the conversation to get all issues out on the table.

Pam Miller, Challenge Charter School, addressed the need to be careful when removing the “Master Teachers” from the classroom.

Becky Hill stated the end goal is professional development and leadership models that can be a statewide system. The program may look different in years 1-5 when trying to grow the program.

Bob Hendricks noted that collaboration is key and the focus should be on how Master Teachers connect with other teachers.

Paul Karlowicz, President, Tucson Education Association, suggested a rubric for evaluation often limits recognition or misplaces it and that a collegial element is important.

Dr. Diethelm asked if the Master Teacher program is for recognition only or moving expertise from highly performing districts to lesser performing districts or something else altogether?

Vicky Valentine, Amphitheatre School District, Tucson, believes it is something else. The recognition programs already in place should continue. She voiced concern about moving her high performing teachers to other districts.

Dr. Diethelm pointed out that this does not necessarily mean re-location but could be a way of spreading the expertise. This will mean less time in the classroom and will take powers and efforts away from what the teachers are now doing.

Vicky Valentine added that the National Board Certification concept allows the individual to grow to their the potential. The Master Teacher’s expertise is very visible in the classroom.

Superintendent Horne offered a third alternative regarding the need for a good statewide mentoring program, which identifies outstanding teachers and gets them to help others in the same school or perhaps in another school. This is what the Solutions Teams are doing.

Carla Nunn, P-20 Coordinator, University of Arizona, suggested profiling Master Teachers would be helpful, identifying where they come from and researching how they got to be a Master

Teacher. Then universities could develop courses to follow this path.

Donna Lewis cited a similar process done in Gallup that identified categories of teacher qualifications and developed a good interviewing tool.

Marie Mancuso stated that they recognize the rationale for not wanting to take teachers out of the classroom, but many teachers welcome the opportunity to share their expertise. Many teachers are ready for additional challenges and would look at this as another option to going into administration. She identified reading specialists are “on loan” under Reading FIRST.

Kathy Wiebke noted that her department sent out a survey to teachers asking how they would like to help Arizona schools, and the results are that teachers are willing to give back to the community. They display a desire to help and give back to the profession, even though there may not be a monetary incentive for achieving National Board Certification.

Becky Hill stated the Governor’s desire is not to remove teachers from the classroom, but in cases where a Master Teacher is in an underperforming school the Governor envisions the teacher in the classroom with another teacher observing and learning from the Master Teacher.

Ms. Kramer cited her experience as a Reading Coach and the difference made with additional professional development through modeling and team teaching available to them this year. The two coaches are able to be in the classroom every day, coordinating grade levels, participating in collaborative meetings, faculty meetings and staff development.

Anna Rivera, TUSD, stated that Master Teacher requirements should include experiences in a variety of environments.

Ms. Basha expressed appreciation for the comments and willingness to share on this critical issue.

Ms. Farley reminded participants that this is the first opportunity to begin sharing ideas and determining the next steps. Part of the meeting in Phoenix on March 29 will be spent on this conversation as well as at the April meeting in the northern part of the state. An advisory committee will be set up to bring recommendations to the Board for discussion, evaluation and distribution. As this project gets underway, the committee will look at components of Career Ladder, legislation that is being considered, National Board Certification, ELC, National American Board Certification, etc., and formulate a framework for Board members. The Governor has outlined her overall expectations and, taking advantage of the seed money, wants to put a program together that will give opportunity to advance expertise in all Arizona schools.

Ms. Basha asked how this might work at the local level, stressing that this program must be meaningful for locals to administer which is critical to their success.

Brief break at 11:25AM and Reconvened at 11:40AM

3. Presentation and Discussion of Core Knowledge Program and Content Rich Curriculum
Cheryl Lebo, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Best Practices, School Effectiveness Division, Arizona Department of Education, introduced Marie Mancuso, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Standards Based Teaching and Learning, Arizona Department of Education, who gave an overview of the efforts at the Arizona Department of Education to promote and protect the comprehensive curriculum. *Please refer to handouts in materials packet.*

Also addressing the Board:

Don Hiemstra, Principal Greyhawk Elementary School, presented background regarding “Core Knowledge” explaining that the title came from reviewing what was required of students to be eligible for AP classes. Students can do more when we set higher expectations. The more content-specific the instruction is, the more the material is retained. *Please refer to handouts provided.*

The Board broke from the regular agenda at 12:20PM to witness Mr. Tom Jacobs being sworn in as the new Governing Board member for Flowing Wells School District.

The Board then broke for lunch at 12:25PM and reconvened at 12:55PM.

Greg Miller, Principal and CEO, Challenge Charter School, explained their school's method in providing instructional latitude through discussion and development by teachers. He stressed accountability as a key issue and cited test score samples provided in the handouts. When learning is fun, kids will learn. Students can succeed in a proper educational process. Ms. Hilde asked how staff is selected to accomplish these goals and Mr. Miller explained that they inform new teachers that they will have a unique opportunity to have more control over what they are going to teach, but will work harder than they probably have in the past. Their senior teachers select final staff from a short list narrowed by the charter operators. Superintendent Horne noted that not all schools and staff will be motivated to develop this curriculum, but now there is curriculum for purchase. Mr. Miller stated that Pearson Learning has published several subjects. This is a change for the classroom teacher, so there does need to be a commitment. *Please refer to handouts provided.*

Elie Gaines, Master Teacher, Consultant and Trainer for the Core Knowledge Foundation, presented further information regarding Core Knowledge, which comprises 50% of their curriculum, leaving room for additional content. Their belief is that Core Knowledge reduces the achievement gap. A basis of Core Knowledge is sequence of teaching. There is no question as to what the teacher needs to teach as they follow the sequential curriculum. Ms. Gaines stated that the Core Knowledge curriculum enables the student to:

- Build vocabulary,
- Develop a strong desire to learn,
- Increase motivation,
- Apply knowledge to a higher level of learning,
- Feel like an honor student, and
- Build a strong foundation for high school and beyond.

Ms. Basha thanked all participants for coming to Tucson and presenting their information.

4. Presentation, Discussion and Possible Consideration to Approve Board Positions Regarding Education-Related Legislative Proposals.

Ms. Farley presented a scaled-back list regarding upcoming legislative issues that either directly affect activities related to this Board and processes the Board engages in such as AZ LEARNS, teacher certification or issues that have an education-overall vision. The summary sheet was also circulated to education organizations for their positions, per instructions from the Board, which are listed. See chart for bills reviewed.

Modifications were as follows:

- HB 2120 Exchange professors; technical correction, proposed strike-everything amendment: not likely to move so no need to take position at this time;
- HB2280 Compliance; school districts: further discussions needed; Superintendent Horne committed to working with education groups on language. President Basha indicated that this directly affects the Board and members should participate in the dialogue if they'd like to. She is not clear what problem this solves.
- HB 2352 School textbooks; alternative format: Agreed with further discussion with members of the legislature that it is unproductive to put time requirements to the rulemaking process as the process is often unpredictable, is subject to outside influences from stakeholders and establishing deadlines puts us in a poor position in the case of lawsuits;
- HB 2393 Education board; colleges; charter school: After discussion the Board agreed with a neutral position as long as an odd number is retained, such as the addition of a charter operator and another lay member;
- HB 2696 No Child Left Behind; participation: Members felt this issue is critical to the

Board's role and we need to protect dollars associated with the NCLB requirements. Ms. Farley noted that while this bill does affect the activities of this Board, it is a politically charged discussion with a lot of focus on state's rights and not much conversation about education value and she recommended the Board not engage in this conversation.

Superintendent Horne reported that the chairs of the education committees are refusing to hear this bill, with a strike in appropriations expected tomorrow which would provide for Title I schools, those who receive federal funds, to not have to comply with NCLB. If changes are implemented, we wouldn't have an approved plan and funding could be cut off. Therefore, Superintendent Horne recommended it would be helpful to oppose it.

John Wright, AEA, added that there is no teacher who would be against the goals, objectives and aspirations of NCLB and for that reason, they would not support the bill the way it is worded at this time.

Dr. Diethelm agrees this is a politically charged issue he would rather not enter into but if the state has no way of replacing monies, they would have to be opposed at this time.

Ms. Farley pointed out that both sides of the political spectrum are opposing this bill based on different viewpoints. Ms. Farley suggested the Board could oppose any loss of funding and take that position upon request.

Dr. Diethelm noted the Board would deal with what is required in order to save the funding. Superintendent Horne stated that both extremes are saying they wouldn't dare cut us off, but he believes they wouldn't dare not to do something that would cut us off because they would lose their credibility if they allowed the state to opt out.

Dr. Pedicone noted that some states are doing this already.

Ms. Basha stated that in addition to the \$300M an additional \$200M in the food program could be in jeopardy.

Ms. Basha noted that this is a big issue and this Board's role on behalf of citizens/children, is to speak out on this issue. She believes an important role of the Board is to make sure children are priority rather than a political debate.

John Wright clarified what some other states are considering in this regard, i.e. Utah, which has state legislative permission for its school districts to not implement federal requirements that are not funded, which is very different than backing out altogether and giving back the money. To his knowledge, Mr. Wright has not found a state that has done this. There are those on the extreme who propose this action and say that other states are doing it, but this is part of the rhetoric that is heard, even though no one has actually done this.

Ms. Farley will distribute talking points to members for discussion at the next meeting.

- SB 1316 Education omnibus; This bill has technical issues forwarded by divisions in the Arizona Department of Education. This legislation has become the vehicle for the Advisory Committee to the SBE, which is responsible for the disciplinary action on the certificate holders of the State Board of Education and this entity would also forward recommendations regarding certification. Advisory committee to be appointed by Governor.

Ms. Farley has had conversations with Mr. John Wright, AEA, and the Governor's Office on issues heard at the Board meeting regarding parameters. Ms. Farley believes there is agreement in the following areas:

- This Advisory Committee would be appointed by the Governor as a standing committee similar to all other boards or commissions;
- This body would have final disciplinary action on certificate holders
- Further discussion is warranted to finalize the appeals process
 - Presently the appeals process is a hearing held by the PPAC, the SBE has the final say, if someone appeals they go back to the PPAC and to the SBE and finally to Superior Court. Ms. Farley recommends that if this committee is the final hearing body, the appeals process would go through the Office of

Administrative Hearings, as other agency action appeals are handled. These hearings are open, Board members are able to attend, and the membership recommended for this body is like that recommended for the PPAC. The addition of a College of Education Dean and possibly an additional lay member are suggested to better reflect the membership composition of the current PPAC. Ms. Farley believes the perspective provided by a lay member is critical in the decision making process, stating that individuals who have experience with law enforcement and education are chosen because of the perspective they bring in terms of reading criminal histories and asking questions. Their experience in determining whether an individual is on the road to recovery or feeding them a line has been invaluable.

- There is also agreement to make sure the language is modified with regard to certification to insure this body would be an advisory body to this Board.

The perspective of the AEA in pursuing this legislation is understandable because at times in history the Department and the Board have been willing or not willing to include teachers in the field in the process of certification that directly affects them. Also in the past, there have been instances where they were not at the table during the final recommendations and were surprised at the outcome. Ms. Farley believes that the present process is very inclusive, however, it is extremely time consuming. Part of that is due to having to bring individuals up to speed on what the current rules are, on the conversation that led to the rules being adopted, and what the Board is asking to move forward. By establishing a standing committee, it will be helpful to have other individuals who are educated on what the certification rules are in the state and take recommendations from a variety of fields, including school psychologists, librarians, administrators, coaches and endorsements, in addition to the 125,000 teachers certified in the state.

Superintendent Horne voiced his support for the idea of a committee to deal with non-policy, discipline issues and his to opposition to the idea of the legislature telling the Board from whom it should take advice.

Dr. Pedicone added that after discussion at the last Board meeting, part of his reaction is to let someone who understands all the issues look at these things, except for the fact that he would like to know what the advisory board is going to look like before those kinds of decisions are made. In light of some of the issues that have come before the State Board, he expressed concern that the committee be designed appropriately so that the right decisions could be made.

Mr. Wright commented that precisely what is being requested of the State Board, through Ms. Farley, is that this discussion is continued to be sure the committee is designed correctly and will be in place for the long term. Mr. Wright believes this will give the State Board extra confidence in the decisions it makes because of the core knowledge and institutional memory in these decisions.

Superintendent Horne disagrees with the legislature being able to tell a body that it must listen to the advice of a particular group.

Ms. Farley cited examples of the Special Education Advisory Panel and Career and Technical Advisory Committee, both required by the federal government to exist in an advisory capacity with specific membership. While we select the members to those committees, their membership is dictated in federal law and a specific balance must be kept. The difference in this is that it would be an advisory board appointed by the Governor. Ms. Farley asked members to keep in mind that conversations are ongoing regarding staffing and her recommendation is that the Investigations Unit would staff the disciplinary hearings as they do now on behalf of the Board. Conversations are also ongoing regarding staffing from the certification area to insure continued participation by the Board but that it doesn't become

an advisory committee operating on its own. Ms. Farley's role between the SEAP and CTAC is liaison with the State Board and this ongoing dialogue is important. It will be up to the Board as to whether they let this entity become solely practicing on their own, creating recommendations with a high public demand that leaves the Board in no position to make changes or whether or not those conversations go back and forth. It is critical that this Board stays engaged in the conversations and decisions.

Dr. Diethelm agrees that this Board is on the right track and does not need legislation to tell the Board to do what is right.

Superintendent Horne cautioned that if the advisory council developed a bent that is different from the way the Board feels, someone could say the Board was not listening to them. He believes this could create a situation that could restrict the idea that the Board determines those policies.

Ms. Hilde urged that everyone remember the word "advisory" and does not sense that the Board has had difficulty making decisions.

The conclusion is for Ms. Farley to continue working with the AEA and the Governor's Office to bring a proposal back to the Board for further discussion and consideration.

- SB 1346 Schools; performance based pay: neutral. Dr. Pedicone stressed that the committee membership is important and the criteria for plan is critical;
- ASA request regarding excess utilities: Board has not gotten involved in school finance details to date. Recommendation: no position.

5. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

There were no requests for comment from the public.

6. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn by Dr. Diethelm. Seconded by Dr. Pedicone. *Motion passes.* Meeting adjourned at 3:17PM.